## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

**District of New Mexico** 

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

**Judgment in a Criminal Case** (For **Revocation** of Probation or Supervised Release)

Cruz Alberto Martinez-Quezada

Case Number: 2:13CR02588-001JB

USM Number: 65499-051

Defense Attorney: B.J. Crow, Appointed

THE DEFEN	DANT:	Describe Fillotticy, Distriction,		
	admitted guilt to violations of condition(s) <b>Mandatory</b> of the term of supervision. was found in violation of condition(s) after denial of guilt.			
The defendan	it is adjudicated guilty of these violations:			
Violation Number	Nature of Violation		Violation Ended	
Mandatory Condition	The defendant committed another feder	al, state, or local crime.	03/30/2014	
Reform Act o	at is sentenced as provided in pages 1 through 1984.  Endant has not violated condition(s) and is			
name, residen	IER ORDERED that the defendant must no ace, or mailing address until all fines, restitute y restitution, the defendant must notify the c	tion, costs, and special assessments	s imposed by this judgment are fully paid. It	
None		August 7, 2014		
Last Four Digits of Defendant's Soc. Sec. No.		Date of Imposition of J	Date of Imposition of Judgment	
1980		/s/ James O. Browning		
Defendant's Year of Birth		Signature of Judge	Signature of Judge	
Ciudad Juarez, CU			Honorable James O. Browning United States District Judge	
City and State of Defendant's Residence		Name and Title of Judg	Name and Title of Judge	
		August 13, 2014		
		Date Signed		

## 

AO 245D (Rev. 12/10) Judgment in a Criminal Case for Revocations Sheet 2 Imprisonment

Judgment Page 2 of 3

Defendant: Cruz Alberto Martinez-Quezada

Case Number: 2:13CR02588-001JB

## **IMPRISONMENT**

The defendant is hereby committed to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a total term of 6 months.

Said term shall run consecutively to the sentence imposed in Case No. 2:14CR01777-001 JB.

A term of supervised release will not be reimposed.

Although advisory, the Court has considered the Guidelines and, in arriving at its sentence, has taken account of the Guidelines with other sentencing goals. Specifically, the Court has considered the Guidelines` sentencing range established for the applicable category of offense committed by the applicable category of Defendant. The Court believes that the Guidelines` punishment is appropriate for this sort of offense. Therefore, the sentence in this judgment is consistent with a guideline sentence. The Court has considered the kind of sentence and range established by the Guidelines. The Court believes that a sentence of 6 months reflects the seriousness of the offense, promotes respect for the law, provides just punishment, affords adequate deterrence, protects the public, avoids unwarranted sentencing disparities among similarly situated defendants, effectively provides the Defendant with needed education or vocational training and medical care, and otherwise fully reflects each of the factors embodied in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a). The Court also believes the sentence is reasonable. The Court believes the sentence is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes set forth in the Sentencing Reform Act.

	The court makes these recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons:	
	The defendant is remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal.  The defendant shall surrender to the United States Marshal for this district:  at on  as notified by the United States Marshal.  The defendant shall surrender for service of sentence at the institution designated by the Bureau of Prisons:  before 2 p.m. on  as notified by the United States Marshal  as notified by the Probation or Pretrial Services Office.	
	RETURN	
I have	e executed this judgment as follows:	
Defendant delivered onto with a certified copy of this judgment.		

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Ву

DEPUTY UNITED STATES MARSHAL